

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of the application are respectfully requested in view of the amendment and remarks herewith. The present amendment is being made to facilitate prosecution of the application.

I. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS AND FORMAL MATTERS

Claims 1-13 and 15-49 are currently pending. Claim 14 has been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer of subject matter. Claims 3, 4, 8-13, 28, 18, 23-28, 30, 37, 38, 42-46, and 48 have been withdrawn without prejudice or disclaimer of subject matter. Claims 1, 31, 32, and 49, which are independent, are hereby amended. Claims 20 and 36 are also amended. Support for this amendment is provided throughout the Specification, specifically at paragraph [0059].

No new matter has been introduced. It is submitted that these claims, as originally presented, were in full compliance with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112. Changes to claims are not made for the purpose of patentability within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §101, §102, §103, or §112. Rather, these changes are made simply for clarification and to round out the scope of protection to which Applicants are entitled.

Abstract of this Application is amended.

II. ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

Claims 20-22, 36, 39-41, and 47 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claims 20-22, 36, 39-41, and 47 are amended and incorporate all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Therefore, Claims 20-22, 36, 39-41, and 47 are allowable.

III. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102(b) and §103(a)

Claims 32, 33, and 49 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,855,425 to Hamagishi (hereinafter, merely “Hamagishi”).

Claims 1, 2, 5, 7, 14, and 31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 7,061,532 to Silverstein (hereinafter, merely “Silverstein”).

Claim 6 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Silverstein in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,993,790 to Vick et al. (hereinafter, merely “Vick”).

Claim 15 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Silverstein in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,762,794 to Ogino et al. (hereinafter, merely “Ogino”).

Claims 16 and 29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Silverstein in view of Ogino and further in view of Hamagishi.

Claim 17 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Silverstein in view of Ogino and further in view of Hamagishi and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,755,534 to Veligdan et al. (hereinafter, merely “Veligdan”).

Claim 34 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Hamagishi in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,827,442 to Ross et al. (hereinafter, merely “Ross”).

Claim 35 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Hamagishi in view of Ross and further in view of Veligdan.

IV. RESPONSE TO REJECTIONS

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*:

“wherein the image-capturing controller multiplexes and outputs drive data for controlling the image-capturing optical unit and image data captured by the at least one image-capturing unit.”

Applicants respectfully submit that Silverstein, Hamagishi, Vick, Ogino, Veligdan, and Ross, taken either alone or in combination, fail to disclose or teach the above-identified features of claim 1. Specifically, nothing is found that discloses or teaches “wherein the image-capturing controller multiplexes and outputs drive data for controlling the image-capturing optical unit and image data captured by the at least one image-capturing unit.” as recited in claim 1.

Indeed, claim 1 recites multiplexing and outputting both the drive data for the optical unit and the image data. None of the references relied by the Office Action discloses or teaches the above-identified features of claim 1.

Therefore, claim 1 is patentable.

For at least similar or somewhat similar to the above reasons discussed with regard to independent claim 1, independent claims 31, 32, and 49 are also patentable.

V. DEPENDENT CLAIMS

The other claims in this application are each dependent from one of the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for at least the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the

invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

Similarly, because Applicants maintain that all claims are allowable for at least the reasons presented hereinabove, in the interests of brevity, this response does not comment on each and every comment made by the Examiner in the Office Action. This should not be taken as acquiescence of the substance of those comments, and Applicants reserve the right to address such comments.

CONCLUSION

Please charge any additional fees that may be needed, and credit any overpayment, to our Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

In view of the foregoing remarks, it is believed that all of the claims in this application are patentable and Applicants respectfully request early passage to issue of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP
Attorneys for Applicants

By 
Thomas F. Presson
Reg. No. 41,442
(212) 588-0800